



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/553,534

11/29/2005

Hubert Spreitzer

14113-00028-US

4132

23416

7590

03/16/2009

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP

P O BOX 2207

WILMINGTON, DE 19899

EXAMINER

HEINER, LIAM J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/16/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/553,534

Applicant(s)

SPREITZER ET AL.

Examiner

Liam J. Heincer

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8 and 9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for specific bis(halomethyl)aryleens and compounds of formula I, does not reasonably provide enablement for the broad genres claimed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant claims require the poly(arylenevinylene) to have a solubility of at least 0.5% by weight in an organic solvent. However, the original specification does not provide support the product of polymerization of any bis(halomethyl)arylene in the presence of any claimed compound of formula (I) to have this property. As shown in Holmes et al. (Angew. Chem. Int. Ed., 1998, 37, 403-428, supplied by applicant) most polyayrlene produce an insoluble material (pg. 404). According to Hsieh et al. (US Pat. 5,817,430), attaching soluble side chains to the polymer can affect the solubility of the final polymer, although the results are limited in the GILCH polymerization (2:33-52). As the applicant is claimed a process based on the GILCH polymerization, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not be able to predict which solublizing side chains would be effective. Additionally, as shown by Taylor et al. (Synthetic Metals 102 (1999) 1120-1121) the presence of bulky groups on an unsubstituted monomer would not necessarily result in a soluble product (pg. 1120-1121).

The original specification does the production of several soluble products (Table 1). However, all of these products are produced from reactants containing specific solublizing side chains (IA1-IA3 and M1-M5). As shown by Holmes et al. and Hsieh et

al., a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would expect the polymers to be insoluble absent these solubilizing side chains. The prior art of record in fact indicates that the non-substituted polymers would be insoluble despite the presence of bulky groups on the monomers. As the claims encompass a much broader range of compounds than those demonstrated to give soluble products, the original specification has not shown a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention how to make polymers with the claimed solubility with the claimed monomer and compound genres.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see pages 7-11, filed December 29, 2008, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-6, 8, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

The previous rejection has been removed for the following reasons. As shown in the supporting evidence provided by the applicant (pg. 9) polyphenylene vinylene polymers are insoluble despite their precursors being polymer (Holmes et al. pages 404-405). Therefore, although Stern et al. teaches soluble precursors (2:66-3:7), a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not expect the final conjugated polymer to be soluble. Further the polymers of Taylor et al. are insoluble. As such, a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have expected a soluble polymer from the combination of Stein et al. and Taylor et al.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Liam J. Heincer whose telephone number is 571-270-3297. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:30 to 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Mark Eashoo/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

LJH
March 11, 2009